



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,458	02/04/2004	Yoshikatsu Okada	03500.017889,	1341
5514	7590	07/10/2008		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/770,458	Applicant(s) OKADA, YOSHIKATSU
	Examiner Bradley L. Sisson	Art Unit 1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10-13, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 13, 17 and 18 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 10-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/152a)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,010,183 (Macfarlane).
 5. For purposes of examination, the term "probe" has been construed to encompass nucleic acids of any nucleotide sequence and of any length, including embodiments where an oligonucleotide or oligonucleotides can have flanking nucleotide sequences, and that these

flanking sequences can be of virtually any length, up to and including full-length chromosomes. The term probe has also been construed to encompass both single-stranded and double-stranded nucleic acids. While the method is directed to a "probe medium," and the probe is to be "capable of specifically binding to a target substance," the "target substance" has been construed as encompassing any molecule and/or compound to which the probe can bind. Such breadth is considered to encompass triplex formation between a duplex probe and a single-stranded nucleic acid.

6. For purposes of examination, the aspect of "dissolving the probe in a solvent in which the probe is soluble" is considered met by the normal existence of nucleic acids in the aqueous environment of a cell.

7. Macfarlane, column 2, last paragraph, teaches that "a number of cationic detergents have been shown to be able to precipitate DNA and RNA from aqueous phases."

8. Macfarlane, column 3, third paragraph, teach isolating DNA or RNA (applicant's probe) from an aqueous solution (applicant's probe solvent) by use of cationic detergents and that the separated/precipitated DNA or RNA is then dissolved in an organic solvent.

9. Macfarlane, column 3, first paragraph, teach that cationic surfactants are able to dissolve DNA or RNA in an organic solvent such as formamide, which is frequently used in hybridization buffers.

10. In view of the teachings of Macfarlane, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to had adopted the method of Macfarlane such that one would dissolve their probe(s) in a solution that comprised a cationic surfactant and an

Art Unit: 1634

organic as such has been shown to be highly effective in placing nucleic acids in a formamide-based solution that is used for hybridization reactions.

11. In view of the detailed teachings, the ordinary artisan would have had a most reasonable expectation of success.

12. While Macfarlane has not been found to teach the specific manner by which the amount of cationic surfactant is calculated, such is considered to be a matter of routine optimization and not a point of patentable distinction. It is well settled that routine optimization is not patentable, even if it results in significant improvements over the prior art. In support of this position, attention is directed to the decision in *In re Aller, Lacey, and Hall*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955):

Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art. In re Dreyfus, 22 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 830, 73 F.2d 931, 24 USPQ 52; In re Waite et al., 35 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1117, 168 F.2d 104, 77 USPQ 586. Such ranges are termed "critical" ranges, and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality. In re Swenson et al., 30 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 809, 132 F.2d 1020, 56 USPQ 372; In re Scherl, 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1193, 156 F.2d 72, 70 USPQ 204.
However, even though applicant's modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art. In re Sola, 22 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1313, 77 F.2d 627, 25 USPQ 433; In re Normann et al., 32 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1248, 150 F.2d 708, 66 USPQ 308; In re Irmischer, 32 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1259, 150 F.2d 705, 66 USPQ 314. More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Swain et al., 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1250, 156 F.2d 239, 70 USPQ 412; Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Coe, 69 App. D.C. 217, 99 F.2d 986, 38 USPQ 213; Allen et al. v. Coe, 77 App. D. C. 324, 135 F.2d 11, 57 USPQ 136. (Emphasis added)

13. For the above reasons, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,010,183 (Macfarlane).

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 13, 17, and 18 are allowed.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0751. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bradley L. Sisson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634